

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

INFORMAL BRIEF

No. 23-4027, US v. Richard Grier

1:19-cr-00036-JKB-5

1. Declaration of Inmate Filing

An inmate's notice of appeal is timely if it was deposited in the institution's internal mail system, with postage prepaid, on or before the last day for filing. Timely filing may be shown by:

- a postmark or date stamp showing that the notice of appeal was timely deposited in the institution's internal mail system, with postage prepaid, or
- a declaration of the inmate, under penalty of perjury, of the date on which the notice of appeal was deposited in the institution's internal mail system with postage prepaid. To include a declaration of inmate filing as part of your informal brief, complete and sign the declaration below:

Declaration of Inmate Filing

Date NOTICE OF APPEAL deposited in institution's mail system: 1-13-23

I am an inmate confined in an institution and deposited my notice of appeal in the institution's internal mail system. First-class postage was prepaid either by me or by the institution on my behalf.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct (see 28 U.S.C. § 1746; 18 U.S.C. § 1621).

Signature: R. Grier Date: MAR. 16th, 2023

[Note to inmate filers: If your institution has a system designed for legal mail, you must use that system in order to receive the timing benefit of Fed. R. App. P. 4(c)(1) or Fed. R. App. P. 25(a)(2)(A)(iii).]

2. Jurisdiction

Name of court or agency from which review is sought:

"The United States District Court for the District of Maryland"

Date(s) of order or orders for which review is sought:

2-17-2023: ORDER TO RELIEVE COUNSEL / 3-13-2023: INFORMAL BRIEFING "ORDER" WAS DUE

3. Issues for Review

Use the following spaces to set forth the facts and argument in support of the issues you wish the Court of Appeals to consider. The parties may cite case law, but citations are not required.

★ Issue 1. THE COURT DID ABUSE IT(S) DISCRETION, WHEN IT DENIED APPELLANT(S) MOTION TO RECEIVE DISCOVERY FILES .

RECEIVED
2023 MAR 20 PM02:21
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FOURTH CIRCUIT

ON DECEMBER 19, 2022, there was held AN INITIAL APPEARANCE ... ON APPELLANT(S) BEHALF. At this hearing Appellant Plead "NOT GUILTY". Also, was held an attorney inquiry and/or hearing on Counsel [Christopher J. PURPURA] before an magistrate Judge. Consequently, COUNSEL was dismissed by the Judge, However, honoring the fact that APPELLANT wanted to represent him-self upholding his 6th Amend. Right to do so... He filed a motion to receive discovery files, henceforth, Appellant WAS BACK IN FRONT of the SAME Judge ON (JANUARY 6th, 2023). At the hearing the Judge [DENIED] said motion. And FARTHER EXPLAINED that his reason for denying the motion was "Appellant would have to work with C. PURPURA if he wanted to see the files." [SEE. SAMPLE BRIEF pg. 9-13]

- * Issue 2: THE COURT ERRED AND/OR COMMITTED MISCONDUCT BY FORCING APPELLANT TO HAVE TO RECY ON THE COUNSEL DISMISSED ON DECEMBER 19th, 2022, IF HE WANTED TO REVIEW THE DISCOVERY.
- Supporting Facts and Argument.

Judge, on JANUARY 6th, 2023; ■■■ ERRED AND COMMITTED MISCONDUCT. without giving "NO" Legal Reasons, The Judge ① DENIED Appellant's Motion, ② ORDERED view the discovery before trial; you have to see them thru Counsel because we don't allow ANY defendant's to have these DOCUMENT(S)." So indeed, The Judge used a string of inconsistent statements and out right lies that FINALLY ENWRAPPED the Appellant back with Counsel... Stopping Appellant from EVER REQUESTING for the files AGAIN. [APPELLANT FORESAW AN UNFAIR TRIAL FORMIN BECAUSE, THIS WAS UNSCRUPULOUS; IF THE COUNSEL HAD THE DISCOVERY AND WAS DECLARED DISMISSED BY THE COURT. THE JUDGE, SHOULD'VE ISSUED AN ORDER" COMPELLING THE COUNSEL TO SURRENDER THE FILE(S) NOT [DENIED] THE MOTION, BECAUSE APPELLANT IS NOW ACTING AS HIS OWN COUNSEL SINCE "12-19-22". AND WOULD [NEED] THE COURT COMMITTED MISCONDUCT, IN ORDER TO PREPARE AN ADEQUATE DEFENSE. THE COURT CREATED A DISCOVERY IN ORDER TO USE DISMISSED COUNSEL TO CONTROL OR PLAY UPON BY ARTFUL, UNFAIR, OR INSIDIOUS MEANS, ESPECIALLY TO ONE'S ADVANTAGE. [ERRORED] BY CAUSING HARM IN A WAY THAT WAS GRADUAL AND NOT EASILY NOTICED. THE COURT COMMITTED MISCONDUCT, WHEN IT WAS SECRETLY DENYING APPELLANT(S) 6TH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO ACT AS HIS OWN COUNSEL, BY WITHHOLDING EVIDENCE USING "C. PURPURA" (CONSPIRACY) COUNSEL'S [JOB] WAS MADE OBSOLETE ON DEC. 19th 2022, SO IN CONCLUSION THERE WAS NO LEGAL REASON FOR COUNSEL TO HOLD ON TO THE FILE(S) [THAT WAS NOT HIS JOB.] THE COUNSEL WAS STILL NEGOTIATING PLEA DEALS BEHIND THE SCENES JANUARY 3rd 2023, HE RECEIVED A DOCUMENT. ON 12-19-2022, HE WAS DISMISSED, BY HE WAS BACK IN COURT WITH THE COUNSEL ORDERING HIM AS A STANDBY COUNSEL SHOW UP TO ■■■ QUIT THE APPELLANT BUT THE STATE; SO COUNSEL DID NOT UP, BECAUSE IT WAS NOT SENT TO THE RIGHT PERSON, MOREOVER, APPELLANT PLED NOT GUILTY. [IAM NOT "CCC"] THE AGREEMENT IS ACTUALLY "VOID" AND "NULL" [HAVING NO LEGAL POWER.] NOTWITHSTANDING, P. MCCLANE, C. PURPURA, AND THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE, WERE ENGAGED IN A CONSPIRACY TO OVERTHROW THE APPELLANT. THE DOCUMENT THAT MADE THE GUILTY PLEA RELEVANT, WAS OBTAIN THROUGH ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES AS IF LEGALLY CONSTITUTED.

THIS WAS A COMPLETION OF A STRATEGIC PLAN. HENCEFORTH; IT'S NOW
 do it the MAGISTRATE JUDGE(S) WAY [GO TO TRIAL WITH "C. PURPURA"],
 OR TAKE A PLEA [THE VOID AND NULL AGREEMENT [EXHIBIT 8] OF THE
 APPELLANT'S SAMPLE BRIEF FILED IN THIS COURT 2-15-2023; EXPLAINS)
 IN DEPTH EVERY ISSUE THAT IS BEING RAISED. THE STATE(S) DOCUMENTS WAS
 threat] "IF APPELLANT did NOT plead guilty under PRETENSE, then he
 would've been forced to go to trial with a counsel he did NOT
 WANT." [Conflict of interest] Moreover, THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE(S)
 ON JAN. 6th, 2023 PLACED COUNSEL AS A STAND BY FOR APPELLANT(S)
 USE FOR TRIAL but the COUNSEL APPEARED THERE ASSISTING THE STATE(S),
 PLAYING DEVIL(S) ADVOCATE. THE COURT COMMITTED MISCONDUCT AND
 ERRORED FOR NO REAL REASON, just was BEING EVIL. IF APPELLANT
 WANTED TO GO THE WHOLE (9) AND GO TO TRIAL BY HIMSELF WIN,
 LOSE OR DRAW... WHY SECRETLY DEPRIVE APPELLANT OF HIS RIGHTS
 ACT AS HIS OWN COUNSEL. THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE, put APPELLANT AT
 A DISADVANTAGE MAKING HIM HANDICAP, INDISCREETLY DENYING HIS
 6th AMENDMENT RIGHT. BY WITHHOLDING THE DISCOVERY AND COMPELLING
 APPELLANT TO WORK WITH COUNSEL; HOWEVER APPELLANT DOES NOT BELIEVE
 THAT THIS HEARING WAS EVEN RECORDED AND THAT SHOULD BE HIGHLY
 ILLEGAL ALSO ALL IN ALL APPELLANT HELD: THE COURT DID COMMIT
 MIS-CONDUCT AND ERRORED; ALSO THE APPELLANT HELD THE COURT
 VIOLATED HIS 6th AMENDMENT RIGHT TO ACT AS OWN COUNSEL.
 APPELLANT ALSO HELD: THE COURT VIOLATED PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS
 1.] DENIED APPELLANT'S OPPORTUNITY TO RECEIVE THE DISCOVERY AL-
 THOUGH HE WAS HIS OWN COUNSEL AT THIS TIME. "NOT FOLLOWING
 FAIR STEP OR PROCEDURE(S). 2.] BEHAVING IN A DISHONEST
 MANNER. DUE PROCESS INVOLVES THE HOW AND WHAT OF THE
 GOVERNMENT'S ACTIONS - 5th AMENDMENT -

* ISSUE 3. THE SENTENCING COURT DID ERR IN ACCEPTING APPELLANT'S GUILTY PLEA.

SUPPORTING FACTS AND ARGUMENT

THE COURT SHOULD'VE NEVER GAVE REGARD TO [EX. 8]. WHY?
 THE AGREEMENT WAS VOID, THE STATE SENT THE DOCUMENTS TO
 C. PURPURA, EVEN THEY KNEW HE WAS NO LONGER ON THE CASE
 BY JAN. 3, 2023 BECAUSE HE WAS DISMISSED ON DEC 19th, 2022.
 THEREFORE, THE AGREEMENT ITSELF IS NULL [HAVING NO LEGAL POWER]
 BECAUSE IT WAS SENT TO A PERSON WHO WAS OFF THE CASE.
 THE DOCUMENTS THAT MADE THE GUILTY PLEA RELEVANT, WAS OBTAIN
 THROUGH ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES. P. MCCLANE, C. PURPURA, MAGISTRATE JUDGE
 WERE ENGAGED IN A CONSPIRACY TO OVERTHROW APPELLANT THAT
 DAY. "JAN. 6th 2023" [See. SAMPLE BRIEF FILED 2-15-2023 pg. 19-22]
 THE AGREEMENT WAS INOPERATIVE, IT WAS BROUGHT BEFORE THE
 COURT THROUGH ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES. IT'S NO JUSTIFICATION FOR
 WHY THE STATE SENT THE DOCUMENTS TO "C. PURPURA", AND NOT
 APPELLANT. APPELLANT HELD: THE COURT ERRED IN ACCEPTING
 THE AGREEMENT, BECAUSE A REASONABLE COULD WOULD'VE DISAPPROVED
 OF IT, BECAUSE IT WAS AND/OR IS VOID WHERE PROHIBITED TO
 LAW.

4. Relief Requested

Identify the precise action you want the Court of Appeals to take:

For the above reason(s) stated, the Appellant respectfully requests(s) that the judgement of the District Court be **DISMISSED** And that ANY other relief as law and Justice may require.

5. Prior appeals (for appellants only)

A. Have you filed other cases in this court? Yes [] No []

B. If you checked YES, what are the case names and docket numbers for those appeals and what was the ultimate disposition of each?

R. Grier

Signature

[Notarization Not Required]

RICHARD L. GRIER JR.

[Please Print Your Name Here]

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on 3/16th/23 I served a copy of this Informal Brief on all parties, addressed as shown below: Mrs. Patricia McLane, # 36 South CHARLES Street Baltimore MD, 21202 and CLERK OF COURT, # 1100 E. MAIN ST, SUITE 501 Richmond, Virginia 23219

R. Grier

Signature

NO STAPLES, TAPE OR BINDING PLEASE

R. GRIER #474750
14160 McNuttlen Hwy, Suite 1
CUMBERLAND MD 21502

BALTIMORE MD 212

17 MAR 2023 PM 6 L



**RECEIVED
U.S. MARSHALS**

TO: CLERK OF COURT
1100 E. MAIN ST., SUITE 501
RICHMOND VIRGINIA 23219

23219-953826

Filed: 0

Doc: 17-1

USCA4 Appeal: 23-4027

CUTTING

MAR 17 2023

NBC Indiana Mail